

AN
Addition or Postscript
TO THE
VINDICATION
OF THE
ESSENCE and UNITY
OF THE
Church-Catholick visible,

And the Priority thereof in regard of
Particular CHURCHES.

In answer to the Objections made against it,
both by M^r Stone, and some others.

By SAMUEL HUDSON, Minister of the Gospel
at Capell in Suff.

*Ecclesiam teneo tritico & paleâ plenam, emendô quos possum,
tolero quos emendare non possum: fugio paleam, ne hoc
sim, non aream, ne nihil sim. Aug. Ep. 48. contra Don.*

LONDON,

Printed by J. B. for Andrew Kembe, and are to be sold
at his shop neer S. Margarets hill in Southwark, and by Ed-
ward Brewster at the Crane in Paul's Church-yard,
and Thomas Basset under Dunstons Church
Fleetstreet, 1658.

AN
Addition or Postscript
TO THE
VINDICATION
OF THE
ESSENCE and UNITY
OF THE
Church-Catholick visible,

And the Priority thereof in regard of
Particular Churches.

In answer to the Objections made against it,
both by Mr. Stove, and some others.

By SAMUEL J. LINDON, Minister of the Gospel
at Canton, Mass.

LONDON: Printed and Sold by J. G. ALLEN, at the
Sign of the Anchor, in Pall-mall.

1790. Price 1s. 6d. per Copy.
Sold by all the Booksellers in Great Britain.

TO THE
CHRISTIAN READER

Christian Reader!

I His second impression of the Vindication of the
Assence and Unity of the Church-Catholick
visible, &c. came to the birth altogether with-
out my knowledge of the Stationer, or his in-
tention, and without his knowledge of me, and
my intention: and it was so far passed in the Press before
I knew of it, that there was no recalling of it. I had another
Copy of it almost ready for the Press, wherein I had given
answer to M. Stone, and some other opponents in their proper
places in the Book,

Also I had obliterated the name of my antient friend M.
Ellis, who had written in opposition to my first Thesis upon
this question, and had left out all personall reflections upon
him, to which I was in a manner, necessitated in my former
impression to vindicate myself; and therefore I must crave
his indulgence for this impression, the coming out where
(so as it is) being wholly against my minde. The Book ha-
ving met with some opposition, and that in Print, from some
reverend brethren, I thought not fit to let this impression of
it pass into the world, without taking notice of what was ob-
jected against it, and therefore am constrained to play

To the Reader, &c.

an after-gate, and to add these few sheets as a Postscript therunto.

I have not as yet met with any thing in print, which should cause me to alter my judgment about the main subject of the Book, and yet I dare not say but some passages in it, may be carp'd at, and are liable to exceptions against; for I am but a frail man, and see but in part, and so am subject to erre, as well as others; yet am willing to be reclaim'd in whatsoever I mistake at any time, and would not willingly bee mis-led, much less mis-lead others.

The subject is something knotty and difficult, and not apt to be understood by every Reader, and therefore let him that readeth consider it well, that so he may understand, and not pass a censure rashly upon it before he understand it. That the Lord would guide thee and me into all truth, is the prayer of Christs worthless servant,

SAMUEL HUDSON.



THE
VINDICATION
OF THE
Essence and Unity
OF THE
Church-Catholick visible, &c.



Since the first publishing of the same, which was 1649. hath met with various entertainment amongst men, according to the various judgments of the readers thereof; as Books of polemical subjects, such as this is, use to do. From some it obtained acceptance and approbation, from others it met with improbation, and opposition. Two things especially have been opposed therein. First, the being of an universal visible Church, which is the subject of the second and third Chapters of this Vindication, and the former Chapter proving it by Scripture, the latter by arguments and reasons. Secondly, the integrality of the universal visible Church, handled in the fourth Chapter is opposed.

The essence or being of it, is opposed lately in print, by some Ministers in *Norfolk*, and *Suffolk*, in their answer to *Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici*, set forth by the Provinceall Assembly in *London*, and *not* *indirectly* *Ministerii Evangelici*, set forth by M. *John Collins* in *Norwich*. But because this was not the main scope of their book, only they touched upon it in their Epistle Dedicatory. I shall leave them to their private opinions, and only answer to what they say in their Epistle concerning this subject. The integrality of the universall visible Church hath been opposed by M. *Stone*, a reverend Minister and teacher to the Church of Christ at *Hartford* in *New-England*, and my ancient acquaintance. And this was in a treatise, called, *A Congregational Church is a Catholick Church*; which came forth in print, 1652. To whom I never intended to return an answer in any particular Treatise, partly because I saw his book was only a logical Lecture, and of so abstruse and sublime a subject, that as it was little taken notice of, so it was less understood by any, but those scholars that were versed in those studies, and so must mine answer have been also. And partly because he only or chiefly opposed the arguments which I set down in my fourth Chapter, and dealt not with the whole book, or the main scope of my Vindication, or question; and therein also opposed only those arguments which I brought against M. *Ellis*, which were taken from principles and grounds which I knew M. *Ellis* granted, which was warrant sufficient for to me use them, though M. *Stone* granted them not. And in them also M. *Stone* mistook my meaning, for by my denying the universal Church to be a *genus*, I did not deny it to an existing *genus*, or *genus in actu exercite*, which M. *Stone* argued for; for I knew though it were an integral, it must be of one kinde or other, but I denied that it could put on the notion or consideration of a Church in *genera*. So, that my question about the Integrality of the universal Church was no whit impaired by his arguments, though they had all been granted, only those arguments taken necessarily from principles granted by M. *Ellis* might have been invalidated thereby. And partly because I saw that M. *Stone* did implicitly grant what I contended for, which was, that the universal Church is not the *genus* of particular Congregations, in that he assigneth another *genus*

to them in the frontispice of his book, and upon the top of every page in his book, and that is Congregation in *generis*. But I intended that if ever this vindication should again com to the Press, I would have explained my meaning more fully, and that I meant by *generis* Church *in generis*, and not the integral nature of the *generis* that existeth in individuals, and so to have inserted an answer to M. *Steu*. In that my fourth Chapter, which now I am prevented in, by this surreptitious coming forth of this second Edition without my knowledge, and therefore I have added this Postscript. I first therefore shall clear that there is a Church-Catholick visible.

Some of our brethren which have lately written, tell us that a particular Church is a particular company of Saints in mutual union, for mutual worship appointed by Christ for the glory of God, and the edification of their own souls, and the good of others. I intend not to carp, but shall give as candid an interpretation as may be of their words. I suppose by *Saints*, they mean visible Saints, Saints by dedication and consecration, and not absolutely of Saints by regeneration, for as they have no certain rule to judge thereof in others, so also they can never be sure they are in a true Church, but will still be scrupulous in their communion, and cannot dispense or communicate in faith, but doubtingly. They are also very tender in expressing the form, or as some will have it, the *Cement* of this particular society, and therefore have left out the word *Covenant*, either explicite or implicate: and so I hope they intend to let in parochial Congregations into the definition, though not independent, for there is such a *mutual union* among them.

For *mutual worship*, I suppose they mean joining in publick worship, and not as we speak of mutual duties between man and wife, to be performed to each others, but worship performed by them jointly to God. But I marvell that this definition mentions not any relation of this particular Church to some officer or officers to whom they should subject themselves, and by whom they should be taught, edified, and governed; and who should be Gods mouth to them, and their mouth to God. I am loth to be too bold or peremptory in guessing at their meaning; but happily it is because they intend to put the keys of discipline into the body.

body of this Congregation, which can exercise them without officers, or because they can set up un-ordained private members to preach and pray among them; and so make up their mutual worship also without an officer or Ambassadour of Christ, *to whom is committed the word of reconciliation*; for Indeed that is the scope of their book, though they do acknowledge that there ought to be such officers: or haply they feared to be unchurched again by the death of such an officer, if they had put him into their definition. They say also that the end of this mutual union is for the edification of their own souls, but that must imply them all truly converted; but I mervail that they make no provision in their definition, for the education, instruction, and conversion of children born members of their Congregation, and servants of their members, seeing by Gods appointment, and the usage in Old and New Testament, the parent or master brings his whole family into covenant as well as himself: and a part of the Ministers office is to go to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, to convert unconverted persons, as well as edifie converted. They say nothing also of their mutual inspection and watching over one another, for which this way is so highly cryed up above others: haply it is because their members dwell so far remote, in so many parishes, that they see it is impossible to do it.

“They grant an universal company of Saints, in a reformed sense, comprehending every individual Saint-member thereof, whether formed into fellowship or unformed: but as Saints, not as Churchers of Saints.

I acknowledge it is true the particular visible believers are the matter of the universal Church, whether formed into Congregations or no, for that is but a secondary accidental relation that betideth them, and enters not into the essence of their Christianity.

It is true, their particular membership of this or that Congregation comes by their union with it; but were they not members and subjects of Christs political visible Kingdom before any such union, and initiated into it by one of his officers, yet not as a particular officer of a Congregation, for none are baptized into a Congregation but as by an indefinite officer of the universal visible Church of Christ: And an indefinite officer in relation

on to his employment, and general object, is equivalent to a general, and that is the prime relation of a Minister, and that to a particular Congregation is secondary, as it consists of a parcel of the universal Church, over whom he takes especial, actual, constant, care and charge.

"They say the *World* is universal, of which all creatures are a part, yet did a man stand where he might see all Countries, and all creatures, he should see but a particular world; really particular, but intellectually universal.

Answer. If by particular world, they mean in relation to a general world, it is not true; for one particular cannot make up an universal; and there was never any world but this one. But if by particular they mean an individual integral world, it is true, and that is it which I contend for in this Vindication; that the universal or Oecumenical Church cannot put on the notion of a Church *in genere*, but of a great individual integral: and so both the world, and universal Church are, whether a man stands where he can see them or no; they are *integrally universal* as *Amer* calls the universal Church.

"It is true that they say, did a man stand where he might see all the Corporations, and all particular civil societies of men, he might acknowledge the general nature of Corporations existing in either of them (or the integral nature rather, and from them all abstract a general nature) and yet deny an universal Corporation, consisting of them as parts thereof.

But this comes to pass because the several Corporations or polities are constituted by several Charters, granted from several sovereigns, under several laws.

But the universal Church hath but one Charter, from one sovereign, under the same system of laws, and the officers indefinite, officers in reference to their imploiment to which they are called by Christ, and may exercise the same towards any of the subjects of that whole Ecclesiastical body, as they have opportunity, and a call: which the officers of the several civil Corporations cannot do.

They answer that text, *1 Cor. 12. 28. God hath set in the Church first Apostles, secondarily Prophets, &c.* which is usually brought to prove an universal visible Church, by paralleling it with what

is said ver. 18. *God hath set the members every one in the body.* And if that will not conclude a Catholick body, neither will the former conclude a Catholick Church.

I answer, the difference between them is great: for the several bodies, though they may have a general consideration and notion put upon them, or abstracted from them rather, of body *in genere*, yet are they not united together into one individual body by any external bond, they are not *integrally* one, but only *generically* or *specifically* one. But the universal Church is united into one body by a visible external bond, yea bonds of the same Sovereign, the same Laws, the same Covenant, the same Institution and enowment, and the same indefinite Officers over it. And this is the primary consideration that comes upon it, before any particular distinctions into Congregations, which consist of parcels of that great body. And therefore that which the Apostle saith, ver. 27. *ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular,* is meant, ye are of the body of Christ, or parts of the body of Christ, not the whole, for Christ hath but one body, in the same respect, and ye are particular members thereof.

They bring diverse arguments against an universall visible Church.

Argu. 1.

Their first argument is, because every part is incomplete, not having the power of a whole in it; but every particular Church rightly constituted hath in it the power of a whole Church; therefore it is not a part.

Ans. It is true, every part hath not the *extensive* power of the whole, it hath the completeness of a part, and no more. Every civil Corporation is called a body politic, and it is complete according to the constitution of it, but this hinders it not from being a member of a greater body politic, viz. the Kingdom or Common-wealth whereto it belongeth. So every particular Congregation hath the completeness of a particular Church in it, but still as it is a part of the whole Church, which is the political Kingdom of Jesus Christ on earth. It is an integral or whole in reference to its particular members, but in reference to the rest of the Church it is but a member.

Argu. 2.

Again they say, that every whole is really distinct from every part, and from all the parts collectively considered. They are constituting, that is constituted.

Ans.

Ans. So I may say of all the visible believers in the world, they may in consideration be distinguished from the whole, and all the members of the body from the whole, because they constitute it: but they being all the constituent members joined in an unity make up the whole constituted Church or body: and therefore that argument was no better then a fallacy. For I can say the same of all the members of a Congregation both publick and private, they are distinct from the whole, for they are constituent, and that is constituted: but as they are united they are one constituted Congregation; so are all the visible private Christians and Ministers united, one universal visible Church: In consideration indeed they may be distinct, yet by political conjunction in the political Kingdom of Christ they are one whole.

Again they say, there is no universal meeting to worship God, therefore there is no universal Church.

Argu. 3.

So neither is there ever a meeting of all the subjects of a Kingdom or Common-wealth to do homage or service to their Sovereign, but they all obey him *divisim* in their places, on some smaller conventions, and yet they are a whole Kingdom or Common-wealth nevertheless.

Answer.

Object. But the word *ἐκκλησία* is never used either in a civil, or sacred sense, but *propter conventum*: and *civitas est a conventu*.

Ans. *Ἐκκλησία* properly signifieth a calling out, and not a calling together: And in a sacred sense it signifieth a people called either out of the world, as the invisible Church is, or from Idols as the visible Church is. The members thereof are *ἐκκληστοί*, persons called out; and *ἐκκληστοί* and *ἐκκλησία* are *conjuncta*, and they relate to, and argue one another. The particular Congregation is rather *συνέκλητος* in the strictest sense in reference to their meeting together, then *ἐκκλησία*.

So *κυρία*, whence the Scottish word Kirk, and our English word Church comes, properly signifieth the Lord's people. And this notion betideth people not primarily because they are of this or that Congregation, but because they are of the Kingdom of Christ, and have given their hand to the Lord. And the word *civitas* and *congregatio* more properly respects them that as they meet together in an Assembly. Heathens may *civis* come together

ther, even into a sacred Assembly, but because they are not *trans-*
701 called from their Idols to Christ, they are not part of the
Church, though they be parts of the Assembly.

Argu. 4.

Again, they say, there are no distinct offices appointed for
such a distinct Church, therefore there is no such Church.

Ans. Though there are no distinct officers of the univer-
sal Church besides the officers of particular Churches, or ordina-
ry Ministers of the Word, yet every Minister hath an indefinite
office, which stands in relation to his employment, which he may
put forth any where in the whole Church, as occasion serveth;
and he hath a call thereto, which is equivalent to a generall
office.

Every Minister of the Word hath power *in actu primo* to dispense
the Word and Sacraments, to pray and bless the people in any sa-
cred convention, though the members of that Assembly be not
members of any one particular Congregation, and though the Mi-
nister himself be not fixed to, or set actually over any particular
Congregation. And that meeting shall be a sacred convention, not
only in respect of the Ordinances or Ministers, but in respect of the
members of it, because they are all the Lord's people *supra* and
702 *infra*, in the proper & primary sense, and he the Lord's Ambassa-
dor designed for that employment. The body of the whole Church
being so great, and consisting of persons of several Countries, and
languages, and under several civil governments, haply at variance
between themselves, it was not convenient, nor scarce possible to
have any constant ordinary actual officers of the whole, but that
is saved by their habitual power of office, which may be drawn
forth any where into act as occasion serveth.

Argu. 5.

Again, they say, there is no Church greater then that which
hath the power to hear and determine upon offences committed
in the Church, but that is particular, *Mat. 18. 17.* which place
say they, if it meaneth the Congregation, it excludeth all other,
if it meaneth any other it excludeth the Congregation.

Ans. I shall let M. Parker answer this argument, who saith in
Pol. Eccl. lib. 2. p. 355. though he held particular Congregations
the prime Churches in reference to Synods, yet grounds the more
general or greater Assemblies for discipline upon this text, *per*
gradatorem, & per sequelam in amandi & per consequentiam, as

I noted in my *vind.* 163. And this appears by the gradation in the text from one to two or three, and from two or three to the Church, and if the Church cannot end it, as sometimes they cannot, then by the like manner of reasoning it is to be referred to a greater number of Elders convened.

For doubtless Christ did not mean by Church the body of the Church, but the Elders, for the body of the people never had any right of judicature among the Jews, nor in the Christian Churches, though I suppose some of our brethren would infer so from this text, And it is very probable that our Lord Christ speaking to the people of the Jews, spake to them in their own dialect, of Courts then set up, where there were appeals from the three Judges to 23, and from the 23 to the Sanhedrin or seventy one Elders. For Christ had not then instituted any Christian Congregations or jurisdictions; and if Christ had spoken of what was not in being at the people he spake to could have no relief thereby, so they could not understand him. Now if primarily he meant the three Judges or Rulers of the Synagogue, yet that did not exclude the 23, and if he meant primarily the 23, that did not exclude the Sanhedrin; so in Christian jurisdictions, which for the general nature were to be like the Jewish, though not in every particular circumstance, the bringing a cause to a Congregational Eldership excludes not the Classis, nor the Classis a Provincial Synod. Though the Jewish police was not long after to be pulled down, and the Christian to succeed, yet it was not then pulled down, but stood *jure divino*, though many of the persons in those offices were corrupt, and the people as yet were bound by Gods law to make use of them, and be determined by them. Our Lord Christ sends the cleansed Lepers to the Priests to offer for them, though they were generally wicked, And in his sermon, *Mat.* 5. 22. he clearly alludes to their present judicatures.

Afterward the same Authours except against the definition of the office of the Ministry set down by the Province of London, in their *Jus Divinum* &c. Because they make it a relation to the whole employment of the Ministry. But whether you call it right or power, or authority given them by commission, or what general nature or notion can be put upon it, it is certain it was in relation to the whole employment of the Ministry, as they well clear.

An Addition or Postscript to the foregoing

clear it up. That was the subject wherein they had power by their office or function to deal, and be exercised in. To them was committed the word of reconciliation. And therefore the Ministerial office is set out in Scripture thereby, Luk. 1. 2. Act. 6. 4. 2 Cor. 3. 6. 1 Thes. 3. 2. as I noted more at large in vind. 233. And though there must needs be an object, *viz.* persons to whom they are to administer the Word, yet that object in their commission is not set down in Scripture to be particular Congregations only, but *go teach all Nations and baptize them, &c.* and *lo, I am with you always to the end of the World,* Mat 28. 19. 20. And *go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature,* Mar. 16. 15. And so likewise administer the other Ordinances to them when you have made them capable of them.

And the Argument which those Brethren insist upon, from *relata* is of no force; for though as they are particular Ministers of such a flock, indeed that particular relation ceaseth, if the flock ceaseth &c. but the generall relation to the whole remaineth, so that there is a correlate object still as long as there are any believers that stand in need of edifying by their office, or any meer visible believers, or their children or servants that stand in need of instruction, exhortation, reproofe, or internall conversion, &c. And if all those should cease, yet they shall find objects for their Ministry, as long as there be any reasonable creatures under heaven; as *M. Norton* in his answer to *Apollon*. pag. 81. wel observeth, where he saith, that when they preach to heathens it is a ministerial act in regard of the dispenser and administrator. *Habent Ministri potestatem Ministerialem non Ecclesiasticam erga universum mundum, & erga omnem creaturam.* And therefore he pleadeth that the Ministers have Ministerial power in *modo debito erga omnem Ecclesiam*. Or else saith he, the heathens should be in better case then the neighbour Churches, if it were Ministerial preaching to them, and not to neighbour Churches. He saith, no duty of Ministerial acts of office in other Churches is to be denied, p. 82. so it be regulated.

When *Paul* and *Barnabas* were called forth by the holy Ghost, Act. 13. and sent out with fasting and prayer, and imposition of hands to go to the heathen; was it a Ministerial work which they performed, or a Charitative? If a Ministerial work of their office,

office, then not onely the particular Congregation, or the universal Church, but the very heathens are the object of the Ministerial office, as it is an office.

The Scripture speaking so indefinitely of the office of the Ministers, under the name of Ministry, makes it appear that their office related to the employment or subject thereof, & not only to a few persons in Congregational Covenant, or particular mutual union with them. See *Act. 20. 24. and 21. 19. Rom. 16. 7. 2 Cor. 5. 18. Eph. 4. 12. 1 Tim. 1. 12.* And hath not the Minister the same subject and object that the Ministry hath, seeing the Ministry is committed to him.

If a Minister of the Church in *England* should baptize a converted Jew, Turk, or heathen, he doth not do it as a Minister of a particular Congregation, or of the Church in *England*, but as an indefinite Officer of Christ, to whom he hath committed that employment: and so the office reacheth that foreigner, not as a member of the Church in *England*, for so he never was, and haply never will be, but as a new subject added to Christ's visible Kingdom.

Secondly, I shal shew that the universal Church is an integral, and not Church in general.

But before I enter upon this Chapter, which hath been opposed in print by *Mr. Stone* a reverend Minister in *New-England*; it will be requisite for me to premise something in general, and then answer his particular Objections against the several arguments, as they lie in order.

It was mine unhappiness to fall into the hands of two reverend Divines, whose principles of Logick, and especially concerning *Genus*, were different from each other; and so while I proved the universal Church to be no *genus* according to the principles and express grants of the former in his *Vindicia Catholica*, which I cited, who was an *Aristotelian*; the other understanding *genus* in another sense, being a *Ramist*, opposeth my arguments, denying the *Aristotelian* principles, which the former went upon and granted; whereas it was sufficient for one to prove the universal Church not to be a *genus* by his own principles, whom I answered.

So it faith with me, as I have seen it with a Country man
in

in a crowd, who being stricken a box on one ear, and turning himself to see who struck him, and to defend himself on that hand, was stricken by another on the other ear, and so was fain to turn again to defend himself on that side also. M. Ellis took *genus* to be a logical or metaphysical abstract non-existing notion, as he acknowledges in print, and upon his own grants I dealt with him; M. Stone taketh *genus* to be an existing being, appearing, and shewing his face in every individual, whether we see it or no, and thereupon disputes against my arguments, otherwise then M. Ellis could have done, and so puts me upon a new Vindication, by denying the principles upon which my arguments were built, which principles the former granted freely. If I had thought the word *genus* would have met with such opposition, I should have set down my meaning more warily, and for *genus* have set general, or in *genera*, or in general consideration; which was my meaning, and so he whom I answered understood it, and M. Stone might have seen that was my meaning also. The paucity of words, and multitude of things is the cause why the same word is used for many things, and so it taken in a different sense, and so it falls out in the word *genus*, for sometimes it signifieth a Stock, Linage, Parentage, Kindred, or Family as M. Stone in his Tractate, p. 2. from *Ast.* 4.6. and *Phil.* 3.5. notes. And sometime it is taken for that common nature which existeth in the individuals, as humane nature in *Peter* and *Paul*, and animal in man and brute, &c. And sometime it signifyeth an abstract notion arising from this community of nature, or a thing in *genera*, or general consideration, and in that sense M. Ellis took it, and so I formed my arguments in his own sense. But concerning the existing *genus* which M. Stone speaks of, I cannot see how it can agree with the definition which himself giveth of it out of *Ramus*; which is, *Genus est totum partibus, i. p. speciebus essentialibus*.

For that which doth exist, existeth in some individual, and there is neither a *totum* or whole, nor essential to the *species*. It is not a *totum*, for *Totum est quod habet partes*: indeed it may have its parts, that is members, as it is an integral, but the parts of a *genus* are his *species*. The existing animal that is in *Peter* is not a *genus* or whole, for it is but a part of *Peter*, and hath no *species* under

under it. The truth is, it is an essential part of Peter, for where-
as *totum continet suas partes*, that animal in Peter is wholly con-
tained in Peter, and holden there by Peter's form; and as soon
as Peter's form left him, that animal was gone. Again, *totum est
maius qualibet parte*, but Peter is *major hoc animale*, he contains
the animal and more than it. Hence Downam upon Ramus saith,
*hinc apparet genus speciei & totum & partem esse, totum quidem pra-
dicatione, & communi significatione, quâ species continet: pars ve-
rò si ad constitutionem respiciamus.*

Now the giving essence, or being essential to a thing respecteth
the constitution in every existing thing. Boëthius also saith, *Genus
in divisione totum est in definitione pars. Species contra, in divisi-
one pars est, in definitione totum.* Neither is that genus that existeth
in an individual *partibus i. e. speciebus essentialibus*, for it giveth its
essence to that individual, and hath no influence upon any o-
thers, when those men and brutes that are now alive die, then
die those physical existing genus's indeed, but the logical abstra-
cted genus of them dyeth not: the physical individual genus's are
renewed by generation, but the logical genus of them is not ge-
nerated but abstracted, and is the same from the beginning of the
world to the end: it ever was, and ever will be a true axiome,
homo est animal rationale.

Here M. Stone helpeth himself with a distinction of genus in
actu signato & actu exercito, p. 7. I know not well what he mean-
eth thereby, or how he will apply it to the cause in hand. But
Scheibler in his *Metaph. l. 1. c. 14. art. 5.* saith, *Apprehenditur res
in actu signato, cum concipitur sic, prout communi definitione signa-
tur, & sub proprio signo i. e. nomine apprehenditur. In actu exercito
apprehenditur cum concipitur aliquid non communi, sed particulari,
dimisso communi nomine.* So that it layeth aside his common name
and notion of a genus in *actu exercito*, and is but an integral un-
der it. Jacob. Martin, in *disput. 2 metaph. thes. 60.* saith *Actus
signatus vocatur a singularibus abstractus. Actus exercitus est actus
in singularibus multiplicatus i. e. in individuals and integrals un-
der that kinde.* And further Scheibler giveth this instance to clear
it. *Genus predicatur de specie. Hoc verum est, loquendo de eo in actu
exercito, non in actu signato, hoc est genus predicatur de specie non su-
mendo communes notiones, sive nomina generis & speciei, sed particu-*
C laria

laria exempla, which particular examples are the integrals under that kinde.

But this distinction will not help him; for if *genus in actu existens* be not a *totum* or whole, but a part, and be not *essentiale speciei* but only *uni individuo*, then it is not *genus*. If the definition and notion of *genus* cannot agree to it, it is not *genus*. The definition of *integrum* agreeth to every example of an *integrum*, it is a whole made up of his members, but the definition of *genus* agrees to none of those which he calls examples of *genus*. In that it wanteth or loseth its universality, it wanteth and loseth its *genus* and its difference or form; for the very essence of *genus* (by his logick) is to be a whole, and to give essence to its *species*. It hath but a piece of the *genus*, and a piece of the form: it hath *integræ naturæ generis, non universæ*, as Mr. Sanna saith p. 4. and Richardson out of whom he had it saith the same. Then if it hath only the integral nature, and not the universal, it hath it not as it is a *genus*, but as it is an integral, for the nature of *genus* lyeth in the universality, which the individual hath not. Though there be an *Ens*, substance, body, and animal in Peter, yet they are as individual as Peter: and the *Ens*, substance, body, and animal in Peter, differ every way as much as the humanity in Peter differs from that which is in Paul, or as *Patrius* differs from *Pavitus*, or *Socraticus* from *Platonius*; to use his own expressions. *Socrates* consisteth of *hoc Ens*, *hoc substantia*, *hoc corpus*, *hoc animal*, and *hic homo*; and so all these kinds are under contraction and individuation. *Quicquid est in Socrate singulare est. Postea. Adscaph.* Take all the individuals of one sort that ever were, are, or shall be in the world, and you cannot make one *totum* universal of them, but by abstraction, & *actu præcisionis* & *denudationis*, and so by the minde you may draw them to an unity, and make a *totum* of them, for there is a foundation layd in the individuals for such an abstraction, but no formal general nature or unity; you must divest them of their existence, and individuality first. There is not *Ens*, or *substantia*, or *corpus*, or *animal* in *genere*, or general consideration existing in any one man, or in all of them, but as they are abstracted. *Plato non est homo in genere* &c. Put many sticks together, and you may make a faggot or cart-load of them, but not make wood in *genere*, yea, put

put all the wood in the world together, and you may make a great heap and integral of them, but you cannot make wood *in genere*, but by mental abstraction, and that a man may do from a little as well as a great deal. *Genus* is another thing then all the individuals gathered together. *Genus* is not by conjunction, apposition, or aggregation, but by abstraction. *Peter* or *Paul* may say, this is my entity, my substance, my body, mine animal, my humanity, as well as my *Petriety*, or my *Pauliety*.

It is true a man may abstract, and as it were cut out a *genus* or general nature out of the individuals, and consider that alone because there is a foundation for it, and a potentiality, so a workman when he seeth a piece of Timber may conceive in his mind, that if such and such parts were hewen and plained or carved away, there would be an Image of the *Virgin Mary*, or a crucifix, &c. yet no man will say that there are any such existing Images there, for then it were fit to be burnt. So the *Chimist* saith, that *Salt*, *Sulphur*, and *Mercury* are in every thing, and boasteth that he can extract hony out of *album grakum*, but they are not formally there, but may possibly be extracted by the dissolution of those things; so by mental dissolution or abstraction a man may fetch a *genus* or general out of individuals, but it is not formally in them. It cannot be denied but the object of the understanding preceded the act of it, but it never findeth it existing, but it is contracted by an individual, and to draw forth the general nature, the understanding pareth off the contracting differences by abstraction; precision, or denudation. *Apprehenduntur universalia, non apprehenduntur illis particularium differentis. Fonsc. Metaphys.*

But I conceive that there is a great difference between *animal genus* and *animal in genere*, between an existing *genus* and that thing considered *in genere*. The individual *animal* existeth, but *animal in genere* existeth not but in the understanding. There is existence in every thing, but where dwells existence *in genere*? Concretes exist, but where do abstracts exist? I will not contend whether universals be *entia realia*, or *entia rationis*, because there is a foundation for them *in ente reali*, but they are not formally one but by abstraction.

Indeed in reference to other *genus* a *genus* is capable of numerical unity; *Ens* is one *genus*, and substance is one *genus* &c.

but in reference to particulars existing under them, you cannot say there is one *genus* in *Socrates*, and another in *Plato*, for numerical unity in the strictest sense is proper to individuals as integrals.

But I will not contend with *M. Stone* about these notions of existing or extracted *genus's*, I shall leave it to younger heads which have been more lately versed in those studies. But if you take *genus*, for the existing *physical, political, mathematical, or artificial genus's* as *M. Stone* doth, then it is impossible to deny any thing in the world to be a *genus*, for it is of one kinde or other. And by that notion every integral is nothing else but a cluster of *genus's* bound together by the last individual form: and so we may make every thing not onely a *genus*, but a heap of *genus's*; and so a man hath more *genus's* in him, then he hath limbs, senses, and faculties. For there is *Ens*, substance, body, vivens, and animal besides humanity: and then every limb, and sense, and faculty, have limb, and sense, and faculty kinde in it.

There is head kinde, and foot kinde, and arm kinde, and leg kinde, &c. and after his constitution, he is dressed up with nothing but *genus's* from head to foot. And by the like reasoning every thing should be as full of *genus's* as ever it can hold. *M. Stone* could not think that I did deny this sort of *genus* to be in the universal Church, for I clearly expressed so much *Vind. p. 82.*
 “Indeed if you consider this society or religion, it is a distinct
 “kinde in regard of the Authour, laws, qualifications of mem-
 “bers, but in reference to its members, it is an integral. If this be
 “all that is meant by *totum genericum existens* it may passe with-
 “out any dammage to this question. So the several companies in
 “*London* are distinct from other companies, yet in reference to
 “their own members they are integrals, and in reference to the
 “whole City they are parts, *i. e.* members.

But all this dispute on which side soever it be cast, hurts not my question at all, though it may seem to strike at this Chapter of arguments, which were taken from grounds which were granted by him against whom I then argued, we both by *genus* means a thing in *genere*, or general consideration, and to that sense I framed my arguments, and then comes *M. Stone* and disputes from an existing *genus* in *actu exercito*, that hath neither the *genus* nor
 form.

form of a *genus* in it, and he strikes at my arguments by that which is not *ad idem*. If M. Ellis's *genus* and M. Stones were put into a syllogism, there would be four terms, for they are not the same, and had I argued with M. Ellis from an existing *integral genus*, he would have thought me wilde. And therefore this is but a *logomachy* about the word *genus*, one takes it in one sense, and the other in another. I clearly layd down my meaning in the explication of the question: for chap 1. sect. 3. I gave different senses of Catholick or general. "First, the Orthodox Churches were called catholick Churches. Secondly, the Patriarcha Vicar general was called catholick. Thirdly, Catholick is taken for a logical second notion abstracted by the minde, comprehending diverse different *species* under it (in which sense M. Ellis took it.) Fourthly it is taken in the same sense that we use to take Oecumenical, and I took the latter sense, and therefore put Oecumenical into the terms of the question; and said there, that in the question in my sense the Church-catholick existing on earth at the same time is compared with particular Churches existing at the same time also, pag. 11. 12. And in denying this Catholick Church to be a *genus*, I took *genus* in the third sense as M. Ellis did.

And I shall a little more plainly set it down now. The question is, Whether the whole company of visible believers in the whole world, which is the one visible Kingdom of Christ on earth, and is usually called the Catholick or universal Church, being considered in respect of the particular visible believers in the particular Nations, Towns, or Congregations, be the *genus* of them, or a great integral whereof they are but members. Here was the hinge of the question handled in this chapter. And the thing that made the doubt was the diversity of the use and signification of general and particular. For sometime general refers to *species* and particulars under it, and then it is called *genus*, or that thing *in genere*. And sometime general is taken for a large integral, as when we speak of a general Court in a Corporation, and a general summons, a general meeting, a general muster, a general humiliation, a general pardon, our general calling, a general Covenant, the general judgment, &c. These phrases are not meant of these things *in genere*, for they are so many individuals, but in respect of

the extent of the subject or object of them. And you may as well make the general Covenant a *genus* or Covenant *in genere*, as the generall Church to be a *genus* or Church *in genere*. It is called the general Covenant, not because it is Covenant *in genere*, but because it reacheth all the members of the Church, and they are entred into it; and so the universal Church is called general, not because it is Church *in genere*, but because it is made up of all that are entred into that general Covenant, in the whole world. So that as the general Covenant is one individual Covenant, so the generall or universal Church is one individual Church or society, whereof particular Congregations contain but parcells of the members.

And sometimes particular relates to a general, as a particular man, a particular horse, to man or horse *in genere*, or the general nature of them; and in this sense it is true, *Omne particulare habet suum generale*. But sometime it relates to an integral, and signifieth a member; as a particular room in a house, a particular street in a Town, a particular ward in a City, a particular drop in a measure, a particular sand in a heap, a particular man in a Town or Family. And so we say the particulars in a bill, or sum, or bundle, so many, and then sum up all in general so much: the particular Brigades or Regiments in an Army so many, and then cast up the Army in general so many. Now because all the visible believers in the world, both Officers and private Christians are called the generall, and in that sense the universal and Catholick Church, and those that live in severall Countries or Congregations are called particular Churches; the question is whether general or universal as it is given to the whole Church or political Kingdom of Christ on earth signifieth a *genus* or Church *in genere*, or an integral: and whether the particular Churches are to be accounted *species* of that general, or members of that integral.

But then comes M. Stone and neither affirms nor denieth the whole visible Church to be either a *genus* or general, or an integral; nor the particular Churches to be either *species* or members, but starts a new bare, and saith, that a Congregational Church is a Catholick Church. That is to say, as I conceive, because every particular Church is a Congregational Church, and

and Congregational Church may be predicated of every particular Church, therefore Congregational Church is the *genus* of them all. He dared not make the whole Church to be a *genus* of the particular Churches, and he would not make it the integral.

And whereas I had proved *chap. 2.* that there is an universal visible Church, and that it is one, I expected that either it should have been denyed that there is such an universal Church, or that it is one, or if it be one, then to have it declared whether it be one generically, or one integrally and numerically; but M. Stone waves them both, and saith, a Congregational Church is a Catholick Church, and so puts a surreptitious question in the room of it. Whereby he doth implicitly grant what I affirmed, that the whole universal Church is not the *genus* of the particular Congregational Churches, but Church *in genere* or generall notion.

It is true if we refer a street, or ward in a City, or a Brigade or Regiment in an Army, to Street, Ward, Brigade or Regiment *in genere*, they are particulars under such generals; but if we refer them to the City or Army whereof they are parts, so they are members. So if we refer particular Congregations to Congregations *in genere*, they are particulars; or, if you will have it so, *species*, or individuals rather of Congregations *in genere*, but if we refer them to the whole Church they are members thereof. And it cannot be denyed but particular Congregations may, yea must bear relation unto both.

And by the same way of reasoning that he makes a Congregational Church to be a Catholick Church, a man may make a particular Church an individual Church, a Church that is one numerically to be a Catholick Church, for all these may be predicated of every Congregational Church, and that essentially as they are such. And so a man may say an individual man is a Catholick man, an individual horse a catholick horse, an individual house a catholick house, an individual eye a catholick eye, an individual foot a catholick foot, because individual may be predicated of all these, and that essentially as such. And so we may make *his house* to be the *genus* of all the men in the world, because it may be predicated of every man. And so we may see
in-

Individual, and *unum numero* above *Ens* the highest *genus* of all, because every *Ens* is individual and *unum numero*, if it doth exist. And so *genus* shall be a pretty *Protens*. *Omnia transformant sese in miracula rerum*. And every man shall be an individual particular general Catholick man.

There is a second thing about which M. Stone bestoweth much pains in his book to invalidate this chapter, and that is to prove that *individua* are *species*. I am not willing to contend with him about the *logomachy*, and the rather because though it crosseth something laid in this chapter, yet it invalidates not the cause at all.

That there is an essential predication of that which Logicians call *species infima*, and he *genus infimum* upon the individuals, so that it doth the office of a *genus* thereunto cannot be denied, and therefore as it respects the individuals it is called *species predicabilis*, as the other, as they respect the superiour *genus* are called *species subijcibilis*, *Burgesd.*

For the Logicians carrying the name *species* no lower then abstract natures which have some universality in them, though the lowest that may be and neereft individuals, did not account individuals to be *species*, for though universals may be distributed lower and lower into less universals, yet are not, in their opinion distributed into *species singulares*, or into several integrals, which are a *totum* of another opposite nature. But they conceive *genus* to be *natura universalior sub quâ alia minus universalis continetur* *Keckerm.* and *species* to be *natura universalis alteri universaliori subiecta*: and the lowest *species* to be that which hath obtained the lowest and utmost perfection among the universals *ultimum universalium*. And indeed there is a difference between *species* and *individuum*. *Quamvis species conservari potest in uno individuo, genus tamen non potest conservari in una specie*, *Burgesd.* 45. So that as M. Stone confesseth that *animal* was not a compleat *genus* untill man was made, yet man was compleat as soon as *Adam* was made.

Again, they say that *species nat' solus perfectior est genere, sed individuum non est nat' solus perfectius sua specie*, i. e. man is more perfect in regard of essence then *animal*, that is, hath a further perfection added to him then was in *animal*, yet *Socrates*

is not more perfect in essence then man in general. The *species* hath the integral nature of the *genus*, and besides that it hath an essential difference perfecting it, and thrusting it on a degree further, but the individual hath no such essential difference added to the lowest *species* to perfect that, or thrust it on further, but the *species* *essentiam ejus absolvit*; it hath nothing but individuality and existence added, whereby it becomes an integral; there is no essential perfecting part found in one that is not found in another, but only the soul and body of *Peter* is not the soul and body of *Paul*. And for ought I know he may make the animal, substance, and *Ens* in *Peter*, differ as much from the animal, substance, and *Ens* in *Paul*, as the humane nature in *Peter* from that which is in *Paul*, seeing they are all alike under contraction, as well as the humane nature, and so make several *species* of them also.

Genus is like a Bell that ringeth out, and strikes on both sides, and so *Ens* or being in general strikes double, it is either *primum*, *vel à primo ortum*; *à primo ortum* is double, *substantia*, *vel accidens*; *substantia* is double, *corporea*, *vel incorporea sive spiritualis*; *corporea* is double, *simplex*, *vel mista*; *mista* is double, *vivens*, *non vivens*; *vivens* is double, *vegetativa*, *vel sensitiva*; *sensitiva* is double, *homo*, *vel brutum*; and then you are fallen as low as universals go, which the Logicians commonly make the lowest *species*; and then the Bell, as it were falls into a single couling of individuals, which are strokes of the same side, and man soundeth *Peter*, *Paul*, *John*, *Robert*; so that the peal of *genus*'s that struck double before, at last when they are fallen as low as they can fall into a single chime, strokes on the same side: and individuals differ no more from one another; then single strokes of the Bell one from another.

Genus bears twins which are opposite, nay contrary one to the other, and so struggle in the womb, like *Esaü* and *Jacob*, of two contrary natures, hairy and smooth, but the lowest *species* beareth only single Children of the same nature.

If a man in his mind travells from *Ens* or being which is the highest *genus*, he finds it divide presently into two opposite ways, one as it were on the right hand, the other on the left, *viz.*, sub-

stance and accident; if he will trace the one way viz. substance, he findes it presently divided again into two opposite ways, viz. Corporeal, Spiritual; if he traceth Corporeal, he findes it divide again immediately into simple, and mixt; if he traceth mixt, he findes it divide into that which hath life, and that which hath none; if he traceth that which hath life, it divideth immediately into vegetative and sensitive; if he traceth sensitive, it divideth immediately into man and bruce; now if he will trace man, he findes him no more to divide as the former into opposite perfecting differences, thrusting that nature on further, but he goes on from generation to generation, still the same, in kinde and essence, like a right on path, that goes further and further, but divideth not into crosse paths. Or to make the similitude more full, it leadeth him out into a plain or heath where are many ways to ride a brest in, but they all come from the same head, and lead to the same town: and these are the individuals which proceed from the lowest species, but divide not into lower differing perfecting species. So that though they agree with other species, in that they are comprehended by something more general, and that is predicated on them, yet they are not predicated upon any inferiours; they may be cut in pieces into members, but not distributed into further perfecting distinguishing essential forms.

So that call individuals, species, or what you will, yet you see they are not like other species.

And to prove them to be species, M. Stone makes them not *diversa quæ solâ ratione dissentiunt*, i. e. though all men have humane nature, yet they are not the same: But *opposita quæ ratiō & ratione dissentiunt*. And truly if it were ever true of men, it is true in our age, where almost every man is opposite to each other; *Quot homines, tot sententia*. But this is not an essential but accidental opposition. And though he cannot make them contraries; *Quorum unum uni opponitur*, yet he makes them *Disparata*, *Quorum unum multis pariter opponitur*. By reason of these distinct forms and essences: well, be it so, but then he must make two or three kinds of *Disparata*. For formerly we were wont to account things that are under divers *genera* to be *disparata*, as *homo*, *arbor*, *lapis*: or intermediate different species under the same *genus*, as *yellow*, *blew*,

blew, green, red, under colour, as M. Stone acknowledgeth, p. 26. But by this opinion the several yellows, blews, greens, and reds, are each of *disparata* to themselves, and so are opposite to themselves though dyed in the same farr at the same time. And by the same reason he may say that every thred of a cloth both warp and woof of the same cloth are opposite colours, and every *punctum* of every one of those threds are of an opposite colour. I should rather have said that they are *similia*, and that *unum multis pariter assimilatur, potius quam opponitur*. But I shall let him enjoy his notion, because it hurteth me not. He yieldeth the consequence of this opinion p. 23. that there are so many *species* of water, wine, or milk, as there are drops of them in the whole world; and so a hundred thousand *species* of water in a pail full of water, and these have all opposite essential forms, and yet are similar; which is as much as to say, they have similar, opposite essential forms. *Gravia bella fratrum*.

But what if the individuals be *species*, yea so many *genus's*, yea comprehend a bundle of *genus's* in the belly of every one of them, as by this Logick they must. Will this be any hinderance that many of these individuals may be brought into one integral?

Suppose every brick hath brick-kinde, and body-kinde, and substance-kinde, and *Ens*-kinde in it; yet may not an hundred thousand bricks make one brick-house; and a hundred thousand tiles make one tiled roof; and a thousand pieces of timber make one timber-house; and many individual men be in one family, one town, one army, one Kingdom, or Commonwealth? So may many individual visible believers be in one Congregation, and many Congregations of them bee in one Classe, and many Classes in one Province, and many Provinces be in one Nation.

And all the Christian Nations in the world be one universal visible Church, and that be an integral.

When the first Gospel-Church (which might be called general or Catholick in contradistinction to the National Church of the Jews; and because then the partition wall between Jew and Gentile was broken down, and the commission issued forth for teaching all Nations and baptizing them) grew too big to meet in one

place for all Ordinances, it divided it self into many less Assemblies, called, though improperly and at second hand, Churches, yet then this division was of an integral into its members, not of a *genus* or general into its *species*.

I acknowledge the matter of the visible Church militant universal, or visible Kingdom of Christ on earth, to be the particular visible believers, and the external form thereof to be their joint submitting unto Christ's regiment and laws under his Officers where they dwell, but this whole Church when it comes to be divided, it is considered according to the places where those members dwell, either in *England, Scotland, Ireland, or New-England, &c.* and so receive particular denomination from those places; but this division is of an integral into its members, as the parts respect the whole, and of adjuncts into their subject places if they be considered in reference to the places wherein they are contained.

Look at the Church *in genesis*, saith M. Cawdrey, *vindic. vindictiarum*, 72. and the single members are the causes thereof as an integral, but look on it *in analysis*, in the distribution of it into Congregations, and so it giveth essence unto them, and they are parcells of that greater integral. Though in the constitution of an integral the parts are before the whole, as the essential causes thereof, yet in the distribution the whole is before the parts, *Cawd. p. 82.*

And whereas I had proved that the universal Church is not a *genus* or Church *in genere*, because it doth exist, or have an individual existence of its own, which a thing *in genere* hath not, *vind. p. 79. l. 8.* To this argument M. Stone answers, by affirming that *genus* doth exist. But when he comes to prove it, he proves only that the integral nature of the *genus* doth exist in the individuals, and leaves us from them to abstract the *genus*, which is an universal, but proves not that the universal doth exist any where, but in the mind of man, or Angel. Now as it doth exist in the several individuals, it is contracted, and is an integral, and must be loosed from his contraction by abstraction, before it can be a logical *genus*, or that thing considered *in genere*.

This is as if he should say, as it is an integral it is a *genus*, which he confesseth differs very much. There is that which may be abstracted

abstracted, but it doth not exist as abstracted, but as contracted. So I may in my minde consider a prisoner that is bound with many chains, without his chains, and so a free-man, but I dare not say he existeth a free-man. I can abstract a man from his riches, learning, piety, nobility, that is endued with them, but I cannot say he existeth so. Where a thing *in genere*, or general notion, or general consideration doth exist, but in the understanding, I, as yet know not.

Moreover as such a nature doth exist in individuals, it is manifold, but as I have abstracted it, it is but one. As it doth exist in individuals each differ from other (as M. Stone acknowledgeth) *re & ratione*, and by his own Logick all those individuals are opposites, and so dissentanies, now *dissentaneum est quod a re dissentit*, but one is not a *dissentanie*, much less an opposite to itself. Now *genus* is one, because it is *totum quod habet partes*.

Therefore you must divest it of existency, before you can consider it as a *genus*, or general, or thing *in genere*.

And to apply it to the whole Church in reference to the members of it: the whole Church hath an existence of its own, as an integral, being *individuum*, as Ames confesseth, but as M. Stone's *genus* hath no existence, but in the *species*. The existence of the whole Church resulteth from the conjoined existence of the members, but the existence of a *genus* is abstracted from the *species*. The whole Oecumenical visible Church hath no *species* or individual Churches under it, whereof it's the *genus*; but is made up of individual visible believers, and then divided into several pieces or parcell, which we call particular Congregations. Like a piece of ice divided or marked out into many little pieces; the great piece of ice is not the *genus* of them, but the integral, and they are the members. Though the whole Ocean were frozen it would make but a great integral, and the several parcels thereof members.

But it would not be the *genus* of those parcels, for ice *in genere* is the *genus*. A pail of water is not the *genus* of the several drops that are in it, but is an integral, and they are members, but water *in genere* is the *genus*. A heap of sand (though there were no more sand in the world but that) is not the *genus* of the particular sands in it, but sand *in genere*. So the universal Church is not the

the genus of particular believers, but believer *in genere*, nor of the particular Congregations, but Congregation *in genere*.

And whereas I had said in my second Argument *vind. p. 79. l. 30.* that *Quod habet partes extra partes est totum integrale*, M. Stone denies it to be a true definition. I answer I had it out of *Burget's dicitur p. 47.* and I conceive he defines it so in opposition to that which he calls *totum essentiale*, *quod constat ex materia & forma*, for there the parts do *mutuo se pervadere, & loco, & situ non differunt*, as the soul and body in man, but the parts of an integral *quod integrale* do differ in both. But to make the Argument pass his exceptions, I shall change onely one word, and in that change only express *Burget's* his meaning more clearly. *Quod habet membra extra membra est totum integrale, sed ecclesia universalis visibilis habet, &c. Ergo.* The universal Church hath its members one distinct and severall beside and without each other, whether you consider them to be particular believers, which are the prime members, or Congregations, &c. which are secondary.

And whereas I had said in my third Argument that the whole Church is made up of the visible believers in particular Congregations, and of such as are not fixed members in any particular Congregation, *vind. p. 80. l. 17.*

M. Stone answereth, That individual Christians which are not members of any particular Congregation, are not formally political Church-members. Now if by political Church-members he means actual members of this or that particular Congregation it is true, but they are political members of the Church-Catholick visible, for they have taken Christ to be their King, and his laws to rule them, they are enrowled by baptism, and attend on Christ's Ordinances, and subject themselves to his Ministers, where they become, though some occasion may not suffer them to be fixed in a particular Congregation. They are political members of Christ's visible Kingdom primarily, by being members of the Church-Catholick, the membership in particular Congregations is secondary, and but accidental to the former. He saith they are members *materialiter non formaliter*, because they are not confederate. But I answer, they are confederate. *i. e.* in Covenant with Christ the head and King of the Church,

Church, and confederate with the members in the general Covenant, into which they are entered, and any other Covenant or confederation to constitute a political Church-member I finde none in Scripture, neither scrip nor scrawl. And I conceive all Congregational confederations and Congregations, to be but accidental to the universal Church, by reason of the numerosity of its members, for could we conceive that all the members of the whole Church could meet in one place, and partake of the same numerical Ordinances orderly, the meeting in several places should cease.

The woman of *Canaan* which *M. Stone* instanceth in, by being a visible Saint and believer, though she was not formally thereby a member of the Jewish Church, as he saith, yet was she a member of the Evangelical Church, and that compleatly if she were baptized, if not baptized, then but incompleatly, and *materially*.

The place which is brought by *M. Stone* to prove the Apostles to be fixed members of the particular Church in *Jerusalem*, *Act. 1. 2. 3. 13. 14.* proves it not, but onely that they abode in *Jerusalem* untill the coming down of the holy Ghost at *Pentecost*, to enable them to discharge their Apostleships, but then they travelled over the world, and joined in Ordinances with the Churches which they converted, as Officers administering both word and seals; and were no more fixed members of the Church of *Jerusalem*, then of any other Church where they became. They were never dwellers at *Jerusalem*, but men of *Galilee*, only stayd a while at *Jerusalem* upon occasion.

And whereas I sayd in my fourth Argument, that the Church universal is not *genus*, or Church *in genere*, because it hath accidents and adjuncts existing in it as its own, *vind. p. 80. l. 28.*

M. Stone affirmeth that a *genus* is capable of inherent accidents as its own, p. 35. and more largely p. 21. with a wonder at me for that opinion. But I must cleave to mine opinion, as I meant it, for all that he hath sayd against it. For I have proved that we must divest the integral of the *genus* from its existence, before it can be a *genus* or thing *in genere*, and divesting it of existence we must necessarily divest its adjuncts from existence also. Now as animal in a man furnished with all his adjuncts and accidents doth

doth exist, it is *integrum animal*, it is not *animal in genere*. It is true we abstract the proper accidents with the nature, and say they belong to that nature primarily, as visibility to humane nature, but visibility existeth only in an integral man. No man ever heard *homo in genere* laugh. And in a Logical abstract sense I granted *vind. p. 106.* as much as M. Stone contends for; but if *homo in genere* doth not exist; visibility *in genere* doth not exist neither. But the Oecumenical Church is not Church *in genere*, neither doth M. Stone think it is Church *in genere*, and yet p. 35, he doth grant a Church *in genere*, and saith that the particular Churches are species of it. Now should Church *in genere*, and Oecumenical or Catholick, or Synholick Church, as M. Stone calls it p. 40. in which sense I took it, and it is usually taken, be brought into a Syllogism together, there would be four terms.

Again, whereas I said in the prosecution of this fourth Argument, that the universal Church cannot be a *genus* or Church *in genere*, because it is capable of being *major* and *minor*, of greater or less extent, *vind. p. 81. l. 11.* To this M. Stone answers, that a *genus* is capable of being *major* and *minus in actu exercito*. Mankind is capable of increase, virtue shal increase at the calling of the Jews: and sin may increase, because the particular virtues and vices may increase.

I answer, the question is not about *genus in actu exercito*, for that properly is not *genus*, but an Integral under that *genus*.

And there is no more put into the definition of man then *animal rationale*, now there are hundred Millions of men in the world then there was when there was but one man: so there is no more put into the definition of Church *in genere* now it consisteth of Millions of visible believers, then there was when it had far fewer members, the Integral is enlarged indeed, but not Church *in genere*. Though a Giant be *major homo*, yet he is not *magis homo*, and though a dwarf be *minor homo*, yet he is not *minus homo*.

So for virtue and vice there is nothing more put into the definition by the increase of them, and therefore they have no other definition then they had at the lowest ebb; now the definition explicates the essence of the thing. The habits of virtue and vice

vice may grow stronger, but *gradus non variant speciem*, they may be in more subjects, but that varies not the *species* neither. So that *genus* being *unum*, consistit in *indivisibili*: take away either *animal* or *rationale* and you spoil the definition of man: and so you can add nothing to the essence of it more then is in it, unless you put a further perfecting distinguishing essential form, and so make a new *species* below man. The majority or minority of a thing respects the members, and so is ascribed to it as an integral; either continuous magnitude as in man or brute, or discreet as in *species*, by the multiplication of members, and this is the case of the whole Church, it may grow greater or less as the members are multiplied or decreased.

Also whereas I said in the prosecution of the fourth Argument that the whole Church is not a *genus*, or Church in *genere*, because it is mutable and fluxile, which are accidents of an Integral only, *und. p. 81. l. 24.*

M. Stone answers this Argument by affirming that *genus* may be mutable, *Totum genus plantarum & brutorum* is mutable and fluxile.

I answer, that the Integrals under each of those generals is mutable and fluxile, but still the *genus* of them, or things in *genere* is not so.

There is nothing taken out of the definition of it by the change or death of the individual Integrals under those generals, nor nothing added by the renewal of more.

Object. It may be objected, that in this sense no Integral is mutable neither, because the definition of it is not changed, though the individual Integral be changed or perish, and be extinct.

Ans. I answer, That every individual Integral is an example and instance of an Integral, and hath the definition of an Integral belong unto it, but every individual existing *genus*, or *genus in actu exercito*, as M. Stone calls it, is not an example of the *genus*, much less the thing in *genere*; for the definition of *genus*, cannot agree thereto, seeing a *genus* is an universal, and that is but particular, yea an individual of, or under that *genus*, and so is but an Integral. If any essential part of an existing Integral be changed then it is not an Integral of the same kinde it was,
B
and

and so the peculiar definition of it must be changed, yet still it is an Integral.

There cannot in propriety of speech be an example of the same genus, because it is but one, but there may be many examples of Integrals under that genus, and they indeed are mutable and fluxile, as they are Integrals that exist. How can an individual man be an example of *genus humanum*, since, by his own logick, it is but the lowest species, & species est pars generis, and pars est quæ continetur a toto, therefore a part cannot be the whole, nor an example of the whole. And to speak properly, if you would give an example of a genus, you must give an example of an universal, not of an individual e.g. *Ens* is a genus, and substance, and accident, and spirit, and body, and animal, &c. considered in the general nature of them. And if you will call individuals species, then is man in general consideration a genus, but you must not bring an individual man to be an example of man in genere, which is an universal. I say, an individual is no instance of an universal, it hath integrality in it, but no universality. *Universalia sunt perpetua quæ per se ipsa nec gignuntur nec intereunt. Philosoph. Metaph. l. 5. c. 28.*

And whereas I had said *mind. p. 81. l. 36.* in prosecution of the same Argument, that the whole Church is not a genus, or Church in genere, because it is measured by time and place. *M. Stone* saith *p. 11.* that genus as well as integrals is an existing thing measured by time and place.

I answer, that the integrals of such or such a kinde, or under that general, are indeed measured by time and place; but the kind considered in genere is not so. My question was, whether the whole Oecumenical Church existing at the same time, be Church in genere, or a great Integral consisting of many members.

But how particular time and place comes to take a measure of Church or man in genere, I as yet perceive not. As it was not drawn from the universal Church of one or two or ten ages, so it is not measured by them: so that though this or that Church ceaseth, yet all the members of the whole Church that are now existing should dye, and the whole Church consist of new members, yet Church in genere ceaseth not, neither is altered, unless you will say that the whole time of this world takes a measure

of

of it, because it shall exist in this kinde no longer then this world endures. Though individuals under a *genus* be Corporeal, yet the universals of them *non sunt ex his corporeis, quod per se loco & tempore subjecta sunt, ut per se[m]p[er] as digito designari possunt, laici Bon-facii, Meta. l. 5. c. 28. qu. 2.* They are onely individuals, and so Integrals that are tyed to *hic & nunc*.

And whereas I had proved the whole Church to be an Integral because there is admission into it, nutrition and edification of members in it, and ejection of members out of it, *vind. p. 82. l. 13.* "M. Stone saith, p. 9. that a *genus* is capable of admission, nutrition, and ejection. Animals admitted man and beast under his wing. A man at birth is admitted into mankind, so is a lyon and a horse into their kind when they come into the world, and by death are excommunicated out of that kind.

I answer, the Integrals of such a kind are admitted and ejected, but not the universals; every Integral must be of, or under one kinde or other: If indeed there were a new creature made, differing in kinde from all creatures that ever were made, then were there a new *genus* admitted into the world, or if any of the former kinds were quite destroyed, then were a *genus* ejected indeed. But by adding the word members admitted, nourished, edified, or ejected, this Argument is put beyond his exceptions: and this is the case of the whole Church, there are members continually admitted and edified, and sometime by censure ejected, therefore it is an Integral; for member and Integral are *relata*.

And whereas I said in my sixth Argument, that the whole Church militant on earth at the same time is not Church in *genere*, because it is capable of Officers, and had once actual Officers over it, and hath still Officers that are indefinitely and habitually *i. e. in actu primo* Officers to the whole, *vind. p. 82. l. 23.*

"M. Stone answers, that a *genus* may be capable of Officers. "Every compleat Ecclesiastical society or Church is furnished with Officers; But Boston Congregation is a compleat entire Church, or a compleat Ecclesiastical society; therefore Boston Church is furnished with Officers, p. 36. And this he endeavors to make out, p. 33. And there he tells us, that an individual Church is a *species*, as it respects Church in *genere* under which it

"It is comprehended, and yet as it contains members it is an
 "Integral.

"Hence it is that every Individual Church contains members,
 "because it is an *integrum*, and yet it is a *species* as it stands in
 "reference to a Church *in genere*. Hence also a Church *in genere*
 "may be said to have members and Officers in it, not considered
 "under the nature of *genus*, but because the *species specialissima*
 "containeth members, it is an *Integrum*.

And whereas I had said a *genus* is not capable of Officers, be
 answered: "It is true *in abstracto*, but that which is *genus* com-
 "prehending the *species* and individuals which contain mem-
 "bers, may in that respect be said to comprehend members and
 "Officers.

Ans. I am glad to see M. Stone at length finde out the notion of
 a Church *in genere*, a Vine *in genere*, a Body *in genere*, I hope it may
 prove a clew to help us out of this Labyrinth. But how doth this
 vine *in genere* give essence to the individual vines, or this Church *in*
genere give essence to the particulars, or this body *in genere* give
 essence to the individuals? Surely not by generation (except by
 generation *in genere* also) but because the entire nature existing
 in an individual vine, Church, body, giveth essence to it;
 so that it will follow, that the entire Integral existing nature
 comprehended under these kinds gives essence to the individu-
 als, and not those natures in general consideration, or *in genere*.
 And therefore either Ramus hath not given us a right definition
 of *genus* (as some better Logicians then I conceive) or else he
 giveth a definition only of an existing integral nature of a *genus*,
 which is onely an Integral of or under such a *genus*, and so hath
 passed by the topick of a thing *in genere*, or general consideration
in abstracto.

But then I argue, that if that which is *genus* comprehends the
species and individuals which contain members, may in that re-
 spect be said to comprehend members and Officers, then the *ge-*
nus and *integrum* are all one; for the *genus* hath members, yea,
 principal members, even Officers as well as *integrum*, saith he.
 But here M. Stone helpeth himself with a distinction, and saith,
 this is not so considered under the nature of a *genus*, but because
 the

The *species specialissima* contains members as it is an *integrum*. And I desire to make use of the same distinction also, and say, that the Officers are not Officers of it as it is a *genus*, or as it is considered *in genere*, but as it is an *integrum* under such a *genus*. And so let me strengthen all my former Arguments against which he hath so much excepted, by his own distinction, and say, that the existence of the whole Church, the having *membra extra membra*, the having existing accidents, the being *maius & minus*, the being mutable & fluxile, the being measured by time and place, the admission, nutrition, edification, and ejection of members, and the doing, actions, and operations, betide to the whole Church, not as considered under the notion of a *genus* or Church *in genere*, but because it is an *individuum*, and so an *integrum* under such a *genus*.

The same existing thing being considered in several respects, may be a cause, an effect, a subject, an adjunct, a consentany, a dissentany, an *integrum*, and a *genus* in M. Stone's sense, *in actu exercito*, but it cannot be that thing *in genere*. The whole universal Church in reference to society or polity in general is a *species* or individual, but in reference to its members both private and publick, it is an *integrum*.

But before he leaves this Argument, he adds a suppliment to make his answer full, pag. 36. viz. "That there are no habitual Officers in the Church, all Officers in the Church are actual; habitual Officers are *non ens possibile, quod non est, sed potest esse*."

I answer, that they are all actual Officers; and might, if they were able and had a call, officiate in any part of the Church; and do actually serve the whole Church, by admitting members into it, and watching over a company of the members of it in their own places, and administering Word and Seals in many Congregations, yea Counties, and sometimes many Nations, but exert not the exercise of their power to the extent of the whole Church actually, in every part of their office.

So Justices of the Peace for the County do not ordinarily execute their Office in every Town of the County, and yet have power by their Commission, if they could do it, and had a call thereto. But as watch-men in particular wards do safe-guard

the whole City as well as their particular wards, though they stand not in every part of the City, and are called the City watch-men; so do Christs Ministers serve the whole Church in their particular places, though they cannot reside, or act in every place of the whole Church, but could do it in regard of the extent of their office and commission, if they had ability of body and minde, & a call or opportunity. I mean not by habitual power that which is never drawn into act, but the power in one officer is not drawn into act in every part of the Church, nor in every part of the exercise of his office. And the lett is not any want of power by their office, but want of ability in themselves, and of call and opportunity in the severall places. And so they divide that full execution of their office among the officers, and spiritual watch-men of this City of God, and some take care of some places and members of the whole Church, and others of other actually, for order and covenience sake, and their better edification.

And whereas I had said in my seventh argument *vind. p. 81. 1. 8.* That the whole Church is an integrall, because it hath actions and operations of its own, for a thing considered *in genere* is not capable thereof.

"To this M. Stone answers, that a *genus* is capable of actions and operations of its own, because *operatio sequitur esse, & am- ne ens agit.* A *genus* hath properties and qualities, and therefore can act; where there is no *species* there can be no *individuum*, but that is the end of all being *p. 21. 23.* It is true saith he, the Church Catholick hath actions and operations of its own, and that it exists and acts its individualls, yet his properties are his own, and so likewise are his operations. *p. 36.*

But answer, that these actions and operations are properly the operations of the integrall under that *genus*. Now because all the integralls of that kind have those operations, therefore they are attributed in notion to that *genus*, and said to belong thereto, but that thing *in genere* operates not, but in the individualls or integralls under it. But the whole Church may, as I there proved, act in one and the same individuall act, as a City or Kingdome may do, therefore it is one integrall. A *genus* or general may act, as it may be said to have members which are the instruments

instruments of actions; but as himself confesseth, that though the members be in the *genus*, or comprehended under the *genus*, yet they respect it not as a *genus*, but as an integrall, so I say the operations are the operations of such an integrall of such a kind, and not of the *genus* as a general. The generall *in abstracto* worketh not any *operari* or *operari* (except notionall) but the integralls work them.

And whereas I proved in my eight argument. *vincul. 86. 4. 8.* that the whole Church is one integrall, by the severall appellations given to it in Scripture, as Body, *universum* Kingdom, tabernacle, house, building, temple, army, sheep-fold, wheat-field, &c.

“ M. Stone p. 33. saith, that these and such appellations are
 “ indeed firstly and properly appellations of an *integrall*, having
 “ analogy to *totum integrale*: but *scilicet* be this *totum integrale* is
 “ *species specialissima*, or every individuall Church being *species*
 “ *specialissima*, is also an *integrall*, and containeth members, and
 “ the *genus* comprehending all his *species* under him, it compre-
 “ hendeth the individuals with all their members under it, or
 “ within it self. Hence those appellations which are given to an
 “ individuall Church are given to the Church in general, &c. If
 “ a Church be a body, then this or that individual is a body, and
 “ all the members of it are *universum*, one and the same body, of
 “ one and the same Corporation.

I answer, that then it will follow that the whole Church is firstly and properly an integrall, of or under such a kinde, *viz.* Society, or polity, because those appellations are firstly and properly meant of that, and of particular Congregation: but at second hand.

For first men are drawn into that, and into Congregations as a secondary and accidental thing, containing but parcels of the members of that great society, or polity. It is clear that *universum* is not meant in Scripture of a particular Congregation, but of the whole Church consisting of Jews and Gentiles entered into the Kingdom of Christ.

We finde not a particular Congregation called the body of Christ, for then Christ should have innumerable bodies, who hath but one, in the same kind, and thus fully join'd together and

compacted by that which every joint supplyeth, *Eph. 4. 16.* which *M. Hooker*, as I said before, calls the external political Kingdom of Christ. Neither are particular Congregations called the Kingdoms of Christ, for then he should have many Kingdoms, in the same respect, whereas the Church militant is but one, consisting of many members. And Christ tells us the wheat-field is the world, and not particular Congregations. If a King hath many Kingdoms, Cities, or Armies, though he speaks of things that concern them all, and all alike, he doth not say my Kingdom, City, Army, but Kingdoms, Cities, Armies. If a man hath many fields, houses, floors, netts, loaves, and speak of that which concerneth them all, he doth not say my field, house, floor, nett, loaf, but in the plural number, as of many: so would Christ have done if he had spoken or meant it primarily and intentionally of many Churches or Congregations, but he bindes them up in the singular number, because he meant but an Integral by all those terms, and the particular Congregations are but parcels thereof; And differ no more, then when a cart-load of wheat is put into diverse sacks, whereof every one contains several parcels of the load, because it could not conveniently be all put into one, which though severed is accounted as, and sold for one load of wheat, and when it is shot out makes but one heap. Or as a great common field divided by several meers or bancks, or a great meadow into several acres by dools, or marks, and so one man cutts and tends one acre, and another another, but these hinder not the integrality of the whole, much less do they make the whole meadow the *genus*, and the parts of it the *species*: so neither do the accidental and secondary differences between particular Congregations hinder the integrality of the whole Church, much less make that the *genus*, and them the *species*.

A ninth Argument I brought to prove the whole Church an Integral, was from the severall words which the Scripture useth to expresse the union of the members of the whole Church together, as *added, builded together, fitly framed together, compacted, all the body by joints and bands knit together, &c. vnd.*

p. 87. l. 18. To this Argument *M. Stone, p. 36.* giveth the same answer, that he did to the former Argument.

But it is clear that the phrases are meant of the whole Church primarily and immediately, and not of particular Congregations.

This adding, joining, jointing, and building of the converted ones is first to the Kingdom, Body, and House of Christ, and there is no other essential form added to them beside Christianity, by being severed out *partially*, by parcells into several Congregations; that is a most accidental thing to them as Christians, brought in by convenience, and necessity. Particular Congregations are but as several ridges in a wheat-field, which hinder not the integrality of the whole field at all. As the dwelling of several men in several Towns in a Kingdom or Commonwealth, which Towns contain only some parcells of the subjects of that Kingdom or Commonwealth hinders not the integrality of the whole, though they be under particular officers for civil affairs: no more do the distinction of visible Christians, into several Congregations under several particular officers for Ecclesiastical affairs, hinder the integrality of the whole Church. First, men are subjects or denizens of the Nation or Kingdom, and then have liberty according to their conveniences to live in what petty society they please. So, &c.

Though a man should have several houses in never so many Counties or Towns, and at sometime or other resort to them all, and dwell for a time in them, yet this varies not his membership of the Kingdom or Commonwealth, being merely accidental to that relation. So, &c.

It cannot be denied but that the several Congregations are integrals in reference to their own members, and so is any village in reference to the inhabitants, but in reference to the whole Church or Kingdom of Christ they are members, as the villages are of a Kingdom, or Commonwealth.

How many bodies politick, and societies in a Nation are members of the greater body politick and society of that Nation: so many less bodies Ecclesiastical make up the greater body Ecclesiastical in a Nation: For it was foretold that the Kingdoms of this world should become the Kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ, Revel. 11. 15. The Ecclesiastical polities in converted Kingdoms, are said to be commensurable to the civil. And by the same rea-

son all the Christians in all territories on earth make up the whole Church or whole visible Kingdom of Christ in the Christian world, because it contains all the members thereof, who are Christ's subjects.

And whereas *M. Stone* saith, p. 37. that Baptism is a privilege of a political member, as Circumcision was a privilege of the members of the Jewish Church *Gen. 17.* Those *Acts* were admitted into the Church, and then baptized.

Ans. It is not said, they that were admitted into the Church were baptized, but they that gladly received his Word were baptized, *verse 14.* so that Baptisme admitted them into their first relation, and that was into the visible Church.

Neither can it be absolutely said that Circumcision was a privilege of the Jewish Church, for the second person, *Ishmael*, that was circumcised was not of *Isaac*, nor any of the other Children of *Abraham*, by *Keturah*, nor *Eseu*, and yet were circumcised. Can we think that *Isaac* and his friends so eminent for piety, and who sacrificed to the true God with acceptance were uncircumcised?

And were all those nations among whom they were chief men, if not rulers, which were of *Abraham's* posterity by *Keturah*, and of *Eseu's* stock, heathens, uncircumcised? The very name of *Elisha* sheweth the contrary, which signifies my God is *Jehovah*. So that it is more then probable that there were religious persons and Countries after *Abraham's* time, beside the Jews, if not before them, as *M. Baxter* hath well observed in his treatise upon Infants Baptism, and these no doubt were circumcised.

It's true Religion did not very long continue among them, as among the Jews, but God would not have cast off them, if they had not forsaken him.

I grant that the seal of admission is to be given to none but such as are in covenant with God. But what covenant? The generall divine covenant, or the particular humane covenant? Surely into the generall covenant with God. The many thousands baptized by *John*, and Christ's disciples, and the three thousand in *Acts 2* were indeed in covenant with the national Church

of the Jews before baptism, because the Church was then Nationall, but by this new sign they were admitted into the Evangelicall Church by a new and Catholick seal, to which their former standing gave them no right. And though as *M. Stone*, faith Obligation with the initial seal of Baptism implyeth confederation, and admission into the Church, yet it implyeth not confederation with this, or that, or any particular Church, or admission into it. Though *Saul* was baptized by *Ananias* at *Damascus*, yet was it not as confederate either with the Church at *Jerusalem*, or *Damascus* whereof he had been a bitter persecutor, but as a Convert to Jesus Christ,

And though haply *Cornelius* *Acts* 10. might be confederate with the Jewish Church, being a Proselyte, yet we know of no such confederation of his kinsmen and near friends mentioned *vers.* 24, who were Gentiles, and yet were all baptized. Neither do I think there was any implicate covenant to bind the Jewish Church together, or the Proselytes to the Jewish Church, besides the divine general covenant with God, and yet for ought I know it had been as requisite for the members of every Synagogue as for particular Congregations now, seeing they were lyable to censures there.

With what particular Church were the *Samaritans*, and *Simon Magus* confederate *Acts* 8. 12? who were a little before bewitched by *Simons* sorceries, yet upon *Philips* preaching unto them, and their conversion unto Christ, they were baptized both men and women; the witch, and the bewitched.

Surely *Samaria* was not confederate with *Jerusalem*, they did not love one another so well: neither was there any instituted Church (as the new phrase is) as yet in *Samaria*: neither was it a Congregationall Church, but the whole City with one accord: neither were there any particular officers set over them then, neither could they enter into a particular Church covenant, as it is called, untill they were baptized, the generall covenant must precede the particular, and therefore were in no capacity to choose any officers over them, and yet they were baptized, and therefore baptism is no privilege of a particular politicall Church member, but of the general. And with what Church was the *Jaylour* at *Philippi* and his whole family in covenant? *Acts* 16. 33. who

who was a ruffianly heathen. Yet being converted at midnight, was baptized the same hour of the night, without asking leave of the Church there, if there were any. And for this particular covenant, though *M. Stone* saith p. 37. that it is a covenant not only between man & man, but also between God & man. But *quosue* where is the institution of it, or any hint of it in Scripture? It may be a promise before God, but not between God & them; but between the people among themselves, & between the people & their Minister. The first and general covenant is between God and man, and is of divine institution, but the second and particular is but humane and prudentiall, and therefore cannot divolve any such priviledg upon people unless the Lord had instituted it to that end. The universal Church is the whole politticall visible kingdom of Christ on earth, and the visible beleevrs are the matter thereof, and these believers are converted, or, at least, initiated into it by Christs officers, not under the notion of particular officers, but as Christs Ministers and Ambassadors, to whom is committed the word of reconciliation; and are bound by their generall covenant to believe what God hath revealed, and obey what God hath commanded. As a Denison of England is bound to obey the Lawes of England, by being a subject thereof, and then these subjects are placed in severall towns under particular civill officers, but no particular covenant is required of them to make them severall villages, which for ought I know is as requisite as a particular Church covenant. And those towns consist of English subjects, but they are not bound to the laws, because members of those towns, but because subjects to the soveraign power of the whole nation. So Christians are bound to perform obedience to Christ in all their relations and places, as subjects to Christ, and not by a particular covenant, except Christ had instituted any such, as between man and wife, and there they are bound by both.

M. Stone bringeth two Enigmaticall places to prove this covenant to be between God and man. *Zech. 11. 7. 10. 14.* Of beauty & hands. And *Isa. 62. 5.* As a bride-groom rejoiceth over his bride, so shall the Lord rejoice over thee: and as a young man marryeth a virgin, so shall thy sons marry thee. But I can find no evidence or hint in either of these places for a Congregationall Covenant. No not in.

In all the instances that are usually given, viz, Gods Covenant with *Abraham*, but we know that was the generall covenant between God and man, and not Congregationall. And the covenants made in the days of *Asa*, *Jehoshaphat*, *Hezekiah*, *Josiah*, *Nehemiah*, are nothing to the purpose, for they were not Congregationall, but renewalls of their National Covenant with God, and they were the Church of God before they renewed this covenant, and not constituted by the renewall of it.

Neither doth *Act. 9. 26.* which is alledged some, prove it. It is said indeed that when *Saul* was come to *Jerusalem*, he assayed to joyn himself to the disciples, but they were all afraid of him, and believed not that he was a disciple. But this joyning him to the disciples, was to have communion and society with them, and not to be a particular Church member there. It is not said he assayed to joyn himself to the Church, as a member, but to the disciples, much lesse is any particular covenant mentioned there.

But as if one that was known to be an Apparitour, or Pursuant, or Persecutour in the Bishops days should assay to joyn himself with private Christians in converse, or some private meeting, they would be afraid of him; so was that case. But before that journey to *Jerusalem*, *ver. 15.* it was shewed them, and by Christ to *Ananias* that he was a chosen vessel to bear Christ's name before the Gentiles and Kings, as well as the children of *Israel*. And therefore might not joyn with the Church at *Jerusalem* neither as an officer or private member. Neither is it mentioned to which of the Congregations in *Jerusalem* he assayed to joyn himself, whereof no doubt there were great store, seeing they had not great publick houses to meet in, but private houses onely, but it was to the Disciples or Christians there.

Others bring a proof for this way from *Isa. 42. 16.* *I will bring the blinde by a way that they knew not, I will lead them in paths that they have not known: I will make darkness light before them, and crooked things straight.* But this will not prove it, but may as well serve for any way that men can fancy. They may as well prove themselves blind by this text, as prove a Congregational Covenant from thence.

Others argue that Church-relation is not a natural relation but a voluntary, and therefore must be by a Covenant or mutual agreement.

A man say they will be my brother or kinsman whether I will or no, because it is a natural relation, but it is not so in this relation.

I answer, so a man being born within the Church will be a Church-member by federal holiness, and so a brother in a spiritual sense whether I will or no, being in the general Covenant. O! but say they, how can a woman become my wife, or a man become my servant, but by a voluntary Covenant? *Ans.* no more can a man or woman of age be a Christian, or member of the whole Church, but by being in Covenant with Christ the husband and Lord of his Church, but what is this to a Congregational Covenant between member and member? Do servants when they enter into a family, or souldiers into a band or troop, make one covenant with the master or captain, and another with their fellow-servants, and fellow-souldiers? If haply they should covenant together to be faithful in their places, and helpful one to another, and this should tend to the great advantage of the master, or captain, and benefit of each other, yet this is not that which makes them that masters servants, or that captains souldiers, but the covenant with the master, or captain. Neither doth any master or captain require any such secondary covenant between his servants or souldiers, and yet it is a voluntary relation, they enter into, but it is voluntary in respect of the master and servant, the captain and souldier, not in regard of the fellow-servants, and fellow-souldiers, that falls in necessarily.

O! but it is voluntary what particular members I will join withall in a particular Congregation, I may choose of what particular society I will be a member.

Ans. so I may choose in what Town in a Kingdom I will dwell, but I must take the inhabitants thereof to be my fellow-neighbours necessarily.

So all the Churches of Christ ever took the Christians cohabiting with them within the civil bounds, to be their fellow-members of those Churches.

The Church of Jerusalem consisted of the Christians inhabiting in Jerusalem, and so it may be said of Corinth, Ephesus, Philippi, &c. they did not pick and choose some out of one vicinity some out of another. If any were heretical or scandalous they had censures to remove or amend them.

Now

Now our civil bounds for Towns and Vicinities have been anciently set for civil transactions, and cannot be by particular men altered, but by authority; and if all the inhabitants within those limits be in the visible covenant with Christ and under his seal, and have publick houses or Churches, as they are ordinarily, but tropically called for publick worship, and a maintenance appointed out of the revenues of those Towns to maintain a Minister over them, and have a Minister of their own set over them, to whom, and his predecessors the Christians of that precinct have from generation to generation submitted in the Lord, and enjoyed Gods Ordinances from them; I cannot see how without breach of order, and removing the ancient land-marks, and introducing confusion, any particular member either of that Town or Church can of their own heads alter this, and pick Church-members whom they list, and where they list, and bring them into a particular Covenant to make a new particular Church, under colour to make a pure Church.

I believe all the Church-members in *Jerusalem, Corinth, Philippi, &c.* were not really godly, but many only externally, and many very loose, and guilty of foul faults, *1 Cor. 11. Tim. 1. 16. 2 Tim. 3. 5 Phil. 3. 18, 19. Jude 12, 13, 16.*

Yet they did not leave them out, and institute new Churches of choice members, but sought to reclaim them. I scarce think all the members of the Churches in *New-England* are really godly, or so judged of their Pastors or fellow-members, and yet they do not pick the good from among the rest, & make new Churches of them, but keep the particular Churches still answerable to the civil bounds. It is a bad way of cure to cut off the sound members from the diseased, and unite them together in a new body.

It is true the civil bounds are heterogeneous to the Church, but so they were in *Jerusalem, Corinth, Ephesus, &c.* and yet they bounded them then, and denominated them, and so they do still in *New-England*; and so the several shoures are to the severall Seas, yet they bound and denominate them also. Indeed if Towns and Churches were to be constituted, they might have other bounds and quantities allowed them, and so might the Towns in *New-England* have, for there is no precept left in the Word :

word to limit either of them, but the Churches would be comprehended in those towns: this is not to measure Churches by the acre, as some foolishly object. But we have both precept, example and necessity requiring that the Churches should be in a vicinity, and not scattered abroad, so as the cannot conveniently meet together publickly on the Lords day, or watch over one another.

Yea, say some, if Churches were rightly constituted at first, we ought not to separate from them, or gather Churches out of Churches, but ours were not so.

Ans. There are three things that I hear objected against our constitution of Churches: First, that it was not voluntary, but forced by authority.

Answer. The members were not forced from heathenisme to christianity, but they became christians many generations ago voluntarily, for ought I know: and for reforming of them, their predecessours, or successours, either from Popery, which was a spirituall leprosy over-spreading the Church, or any other superstition, and reforming of them by authority and compulsion, I think it is no more then the Magistrate might yea ought to do, and the godly Kings and Rulers in the Old Testament did, and were commended and blest for doing. Indeed a man cannot regularly compell a woman to be his wife against her will; nor a man compell another to be his servant, or apprentice, but if they have once bound themselves by marriage, promise, or indenture, they may compel them to hold so, and to obey and reform themselves. So is the case between Christ and his visible Church.

Secondly it is objected that we are not fit matter for a Church, and therefore not fit to be made Churches, or to be joined with all.

Answer. was there not as unfit matter in the Jewish Church before Christs coming, and yet the Church for the essence of it was the same then and now? yea was there not as unfit matter in the Churches in the Apostles time at *Corinth* and *Phillippi* &c? see the texts before named, and tell me if we have worse matter then there was; and yet what the Gospell there saith, it saith to them that are under the Gospell. Give an instance of any man or woman that ever professed beleeve in, and subjection to Christ in all the

the New Testament that ever was denied admission into the visible Church, or that was cast out merely for want of the power of godliness. The Apostles instructed, informed, reprov'd, and sought to amend them, and if they were hereticall, or notorious and obstinate, excommunicated them; and that we allow and could heartily wish were still done, and hope may in due time.

Doth a shepherd turn the diseased sheep out of his flock quite, and feed only the sound ones? no, he is to *strengthen the diseased, and heal the sick, and bind up the broken, and bring again that which was driven away, and seek up that which is lost*, Ezek. 34. 4. Indeed it is requisite he should separate the scabbed and diseased from the rest for a time, lest they infect the rest, and then having cured them to put them together into the same fold. Ministers are sent to *the lost sheep of the house of Israel*, as Christ commandeth, Mat. 10. 6. and not to feed the sound ones only that went not astray: and what manner of people Christ meant by those lost sheep, I need not tell you, such I believe as many in our age would have passed by, as the Priest and Levite did the wounded man in the parable, or counted goats rather than sheep.

Yea but the members of the Churches in the New Testament that grew so corrupt, did not appear so at their admission into the Church.

Ans. We know they were new Converts to the faith of Christ, and immediately admitted by baptism, even by thousands of a day, and that when they were men grown, without any strict enquiry of the truth of grace in them, and without any waiting for experience of their godly conversation.

Philip baptized *Simon* the Sorcerer after his profession of his belief in Christ, who yet was in the gall of bitterness and bond of iniquity, and of all men one would have thought he should have been well tryed first, but was not.

And the Apostle saith of some members in the Church of *Corinth*, that they had not the knowledg of God, he spake it to their shame. Surely if they had had it at their first admission into Church, they would not have lost it afterward, under the Ministry of their teachers. Indeed they might corrupt in manners, or in judgment, but not lose their knowledg, and grow sottis.

But there is a great deal of difference between a Church at the first constitution of it, when possibly they may pick choice members, as they did at first in N. E. when they went over thither; men converted by the Ministry in Old England before they went thither; and a successive Church in after ages, which consist of a new generation, and seed of the former, *atque parentum peior avis, tulit nos nequiores, mox daturos progeniem vitiosorem.* The Churches succeeding the Apostles age were not so pure as in the Apostles times, and yet then they were bad enough: and I fear the succeeding Churches in N. E. will not prove altogether so pure and eminent for sincerity of grace and holy conversation as their first were; and yet our brethren do not hold that corrupt members in such a successive Church doth unchurch them; and alas that is our condition in this nation, the Lord in mercy reform and amend us.

Thirdly it is objected against us, that we are not rightly constituted, because we want an explicate Congregational covenant; and so the true form.

Answer, Thus you see I am enforced to return to speak of the Covenant again.

But I answer, that all our Brethren for the Congregationall way do not unchurch us for want of that; and I think I may clear our Brethren in N. E. from that aspersion: and some of our Brethren at home who have lately written, require but a mutual agreement for joint worship of God, and I am sure that may be found in our Congregations, and both have been, and might be more, but for these new scruples put into their minds.

For my part I am not against an explicate Covenant in our Congregations, but wish they were as willing to it, as they are in many places willing to come to an agreement with their Ministers for their tithes, if they can get advantage thereby, as most what they do abundantly. For by such a covenant, I conceive they should be more bound to their Ministers, as well as their Ministers to them; and it might haply be a means to cause them to submit the better to our instructions, reproofs, admonitions, inspection and discipline; but I dare not stamp *ut diximus* upon it, neither do I find any hint of it in Scripture or primitive times, and therefore cannot believe there was any: but that they stood bound.

bound by their general Covenant to submit to the Ministers that were set over them in the Lord, in their several places. Neither dare I think it is that which gives people right to Gods Ordinances, nor that it can divolve such a priviledge upon the members that enter into it, to invest them with the power of the keys, to admit members, make officers, to invest and divest them, and have all Church power radically in themselves.

I know M. Stone doth not make it the form of a particular Congregation, but the *Cement* rather; but truly as it is used or abused rather, by many about us, I fear it will prove but untimpered mortar. For first people are so sager of it, that some people will join with Antipaedobaptists, Millenaries, and first monarchymen, or any sect so they may but be in a covenant. Secondly, it is raised up as a partition wall between them and all the rest of the Churches of Christ (though they be in implicite covenant, and agreement together, and with their Pastors) so that they will not communicate with them, though never so religious, reformed, and eminent Congregations, nor suffer any of them, though never so godly and so acknowledged by them to communicate with themselves. They will not baptize any of our children, nor suffer us to baptize any of theirs: nay they will not so much as stay to see any of our children baptized, if they be occasionally at a Lecture where any such child is to be baptized, though they know the parents be very godly, and the Minister bee godly that is to baptize them, and though there bee nothing offensive in the manner of administration of Baptism, but run out, as if the Church were on fire over their heads. Thirdly, as it occasioneth the breach of many marriages that else would be suitable, so it many times manifestly great breaches after marriages betwixt man and wife, even to the antichristianizing, or at least to the unchurching one of another, and chusef jars and alienation of affections, and vain-jangling and disputes, and unchristian heats and animosities instead of sweet Christian love, unity, and communion, and mutual edification. Fourthly, it exceedingly hinders family-duties, that they can neither join so cordially together in prayer, having such sinister thoughts one of another, nor yet in Catechizing of their families; nor calling over the Word publicly taught, or calling

children and servants to an account for what they have heard publickly, because one runs to one Town to the publick Ordinances, and another to another, and one draws some of the family one way, and the other another. Fifthly it is used as a means to enthrall the members that are entred into it, so that though they marry out of that Town, or remove their dwellings out by necessity or for convenience, and dwell never so far distant from them, yet must they remain members of that Congregation, and may not join with any other Church, without their leave and dismission, which they will not give, except that Church with which they would join be constituted, or instituted, as the new phrase is, by an explicate Covenant, as sad experience hath proved: nay, are not permitted to join with a Congregation, though never so eminent for godliness and reformation; no, not though the person acknowledgeth, not only the Minister to be godly and eminent, but also the instrument under God of the work of grace in him formerly.

Yea it is accounted no less then spiritual adultery to depart from them after they are thus joined, without their dismission, which they will not give, except to a new instituted Church of the same kind.

If it be such a snare, it is good for single persons to keep out of that bond untill they see how and where God will dispose of them by marriage; and for married persons to get as long leases of their farms as they can, and keep their yoke yellows as long as they can, for if they dye, they lay a great bar in their own way against a second marriage, except to one of their own Church, or one of like constitution. I do not conceive that God ever bound any man or woman to such inconveniences, onely they must not marry, but in the Lord, saith the Apostle; nor yet do our brethren in *New-England* put any such yoke upon the Disciples necks, as far as I understand; neither do I think a brother or sister is in bondage in such a case, but this use or rather abuse is made of this Covenant by some in our Country.

It is a harsh censure which *M. Sam. Mather*, a young man as I hear, hath given against such as are not of his judgement in this point, in his preface before *M. Stongs Book*, "As if the dread-

"dreadful revenges of God, either for personal pollutions, or for
 "sinfull compliance with former devices, or wayes of men in
 "the things of his house, or for secret contempt of the simplici-
 "ty and power of the Gospel, are gone forth in penal blindness,
 "and other blasting strokes, upon the souls of some in these
 "times.

As if this were the very pattern shewed in the Mount, and
 the very fashion and form of the house shewed to the Prophet
 Ezekiel, Ezek. 43. 10. 11. as is there intimated. But we pray you
 is it a pattern revealed in the Word of God, or by inspiration
 onely? If it be set down in the Word of God, we beseech you
 be pleased to shew it unto us, and point us to the texts of Scrip-
 ture that hold it forth: we hope some of us desire to fear and
 serve God in truth, as well as among you. How many worthy
 Martyrs, Ministers, and eminent Christians have dyed for the
 faith, and in the faith, and gone to heaven, before either M. Ma-
 tther, or this Covenant were born; were they all, stricken with
 the dreadfull revenges of God in penal blindness and blasting
 strokes? I believe our brethren will not say so.

And if this Church-Covenant hath no better effects else-
 where, then it hath in these parts, as I shewed before, tru-
 ly it were better it never had been devised, or were made
 Nebushtan.

M. Stone calls the Universal Church, *Totum genericum existens*,
 as M. Hooker did also in his book; of which I said vind. 40 that
 it is nothing else but *integrum simile*. But I do acknow-
 ledge that though *totum genericum existens* may be *integrum simi-
 lare*, yet is not always so. It is so when all of that kind that ex-
 isteth is bound together in one *copula* or bond.

As if all the Sand in the world were on one heap, or all the
 Gold in the world were of one lump, they were integralls.

Or if there be such a bird as the Phoenix, it is *totum genericum
 existens*, and yet it is an integrall. But if there be no such bond,
 then it is not an integrall yet they are not that thing *in genere*, nor
 the genus of all that kind. But the universall visible Church,
 though it be *totum genericum existens*, i. e. all of that kind of soci-
 ety or body that existeth, yet it is an integrall, because it is bound
 together by an externall visible bond, yea bonds, as hath been

shewed before; & that Covenant with God in Christ, & the seal of Baptisme, which makes them of that kind compleatly, makes them also of that integral, *et formali ratione*, and they cannot be of that kind, except they enter in as members of that integrall.

I acknowledg also that the instance of the nature of a flock not reserved in one sheep, or of a Corporation reserved in one man, mentioned *vind. p. 79*, which M. Stone puts me twice in mind of, was misplaced and misapplied there; for the flock is not the *genus* of sheep, nor the Corporation of the men in it; but both flock and Corporation are each of them integrals, and so is the whole Church.

M. Stone also findes fault that I said *vind. p. 78*, that that which existeth in the individuall in *ipsa causa materialis individui*. It helike not that expression; let him take the former mentioned but three lines before it, it is *pars essentialis individui*, for it goeth to the constitution of the essence of it, but it is not the *genus* of the integral, or that thing *in genere*.

And whereas I said *vind. p. 216*, that I do not mean that the universall Church is first in regard of constitution of the whole political Kingdome of Christ by aggregation and combination, because the particular Congregations must exist before they can be combined and aggregated. I now declare that the first matter of the universall Church are particular visible beleivers, that are drawn into the generall Covenant, and these are secondarily combined into particular combinations, and so the combinations of Congregations in the universall Church is not the first combination, but a secondary; and in the distribution or *analysis* of the Church Catholick, they are accounted members of the distribution, but in the *genesis* or constitution, the particular members are first constitutive.

I shall also be willing that the eighth way whereby the whole Church may be accounted the prime Church, namely *cognitione sine hostibilitate perfecta*, mentioned *vind. 218. 219. and 253* may be left out; because it is more proper to a generall nature than an integrall: and so may be said of the Church as it is a kind of society differing from others, rather than as it is an integral consisting of members, for there the members are first considered.

And to M. Stones objection against what I said *vind. p. 219* and

pro, that the priority of the Church-Catholick in respect of the particular, is like the priority of a Kingdom to the parts of it, or of a Corporation to the parts of it, which said is not meant in a mathematicall or technicall consideration.

I answer once again, that the members of the universal Church which are the particular visible believers, are, as it is an integral, in consideration before the whole, because the whole is made up of them, as a kingdom of all the members of the kingdom, and all the towns in it are made up of the members of the kingdom, and so are all particular Congregations of the members of the universal Church; and in the distribution of the whole into parts there the whole is considered first, and then is distributed not onely into particular members, but into combined members dwelling in severall Countries, or less secondary combinations, and so even those secondary combinations may be said to make up that whole, for of such parts as the whole is distributed into, of such it is also constituted.

But the particular Congregations are made up onely of such as are members of the whole Church, and they are entred into that body, before they are considered as members of the petty severall societies.

And for the unity and priority of the Catholick Church, M. Cotton upon *Gent.* 6. 9. p. 191. hath this passage. "The Church is one, i. e. at unity or brotherly love one with another, as one body, though scattered into many places, as England, Scotland, Germany, &c. in all Christendom. Some Churches are more chaste, mild, and unspotted then others, even of the same Country, and yet such are but few, and though few, yet an entire unity as one body. The onely one of her mother, the choicest one of her that hure her. In the Hebrew phrase, saith he, the whole is the mother, the parts are the members. The true Catholick Church of Christ is the mother of all the reformed daughters, and these daughter-Churches that are most chaste, and mild, and undefiled they are best esteemed, and best beloved of the mother Catholick Church.

Whence we note, that there is a Church-Catholick, and that particular Churches are the daughters of that Church, and these daughters are parts and members of that one body, and therefore not

not species, and this must consist of the same nature that the members do which constitute it, and so be visible, else I know not what sense to make of M. Cottons words.

It seemeth very strange to me that whereas the Scripture speaketh so much of the Kingdom of Christ, the Kingdom of God, the Kingdom of his dear Son, and Christ's everlasting Kingdom, and of the amplitude thereof from sea to sea, and from the flood to the worlds end, that all this should be nothing else but a Kingdom in genere, or a general Kingdom in a Logical notion, comprehending none but a few particular Congregations, consisting of 7. 10. 20. 40. or 60. persons therein, united in an explicite Congregational Covenant, and no universal or large integral Kingdom whereof they are but members or parcels.

As if a King should be famous for a large and glorious Kingdom, and when all cometh to all, is nothing but a few little Islands that stand independent at a distance one from another, and have no other union together but that they are all ruled by the same King, and are as so many petty kingdoms under him, having nothing to do one with another, but only to live in love and peace together. I conceive this is a very great eclipsing of the glory of Christ in his Kingly office and honour. I should listen after the interpretation that our brethren give of *Act. 8. 3.* and *Gal. 1. 13.* of *Saul's* persecuting the Church; and *Act. 2. 47.* of the adding of people to the Church; and *1 Cor. 12. 28.* of God's setting Officers in the Church to be meant *apls & yds*, if the Scripture did not so abundantly speak of the unity and amplitude of the Church, and bonds whereby all of that sort are bound together in an Integral. But for my part I cannot see how it is possible for a man to enter compleatly into that *yds* or kind, but he must withal enter into that Integral; and that this Integral must receive not only several Congregations, but even whole Christian Nations, and even single persons converted, though they should not bee joined in any particular Congregations. I should have added many other things, but that I would not exceed the bounds of a Postscript, and the Press stayeth for this. The Lord guide us into all truth.

FINIS.